REMARKS

Present Status of Application

Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application. The Office Action mailed on March 15, 2006 rejected claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ding US Patent No. 6,430,663 ("Ding" hereinafter) in view of Raghavan et al. US Patent No. 6,931,522 ("Raghavan" hereinafter). The Office Action also rejected claims 1, 4-5, 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khanna US Patent No. 6,550,006 ("Khanna" hereinafter) in view of Raghavan.

Applicant has amended claim 1, cancelled claims 2 and 4, and added claims 15-26. Claim 1 has been amended to include all limitations of original claims 1 and 2. Claim 2 has been cancelled because it is now redundant. Claim 4 has been cancelled because its limitations are incompatible with those of new claim 1. New claim 15 includes all limitations of original claims 1 and 3. New claim 16 is copied from original claim 2. New claims 17-26 are copied from original claims 5-14. Applicant believes that these changes do not introduce new matter and reconsideration of claims 1, 3 and 5-26 is respectfully requested. In view of the above amendments and the following discussions, a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Discussion for 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections

In regard to claim 1, claim 1 includes all limitations of original claims 1 and 2.

- 8 -

Therefore claim 1 is equivalent to original claim 2 written in independent form. The Office Action rejected original claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ding in view of Raghavan. Applicant respectfully disagrees and believes that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Ding, Raghavan and Khanna for at least the reasons below.

The Office Action stated that Ding teaches the selecting the multi-partition boot selection flag is performed by an embedded controller in the computer [col. 2 lines 51-56; col. 5 lines 65-67]. In fact, Ding [col. 2 lines 51-56; col. 5 lines 65-67] teaches nothing about embedded controller. The boot select code and MBR code in Ding [col. 2 lines 51-56; col. 5 lines 65-67] cannot render the embedded controller in claim 1 obvious, either. Each of the boot select code and the MBR code in Ding is **software** and is obviously different from the embedded controller in claim 1, which is a piece of **hardware**. Furthermore, neither Raghavan nor Khanna teaches "selecting the multi-partition boot selection flag is performed by an embedded controller in the computer" as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons above, Applicant believes that claim 1 is non-obvious over the combination of Ding, Raghavan and Khanna and is allowable. Since each of claims 3 and 5-14 is dependent on claim 1 and includes all limitations of claim 1, claims 3and 5-14 are also allowable as a matter of law.

-9-

In regard to claim 15, claim 15 includes all limitations of original claims 1 and 3. Therefore claim 15 is equivalent to original claim 3 written in independent form. The Office Action rejected original claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ding in view of Raghavan. Applicant respectfully disagrees and believes that claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Ding, Raghavan and Khanna for at least the reasons below.

The Office Action stated that Ding teaches the selecting the multi-partition boot selection flag is performed by a keyboard controller in the computer [fig. 3B]. In fact, fig. 3B in Ding only teaches a selection window and selecting a boot partition by pressing number keys. Ding teaches nothing about keyboard controller. The keyboard controller in claim 15 is a **hardware component**, which is obviously different from the **software solution** in Ding. Furthermore, neither Raghavan nor Khanna teaches "selecting the multi-partition boot selection flag is performed by a keyboard controller in the computer" as recited in claim 15.

For at least the reasons above, Applicant believes that claim 15 is non-obvious over the combination of Ding, Raghavan and Khanna and is allowable. Since each of claims 16-26 is dependent on claim 15 and includes all limitations of claim 15, claims 16-26 are also allowable as a matter of law.

-10-

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 USC 103(a) are

respectfully requested.

-11-

Customer No.:31561
Application No.: 10/605,916
Docket No.: 10939-US-PA

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : *May 30, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
       Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

-12-